HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XIV, No. 34 August 24, 1957 Washington, D. C.

Printed in Two Sections

STATE COLLEGE
WISCONSIN

News Section

FOREIGN AID: *Cuts justified* (page 1)

LABOR: *Reuther's snare* (page 2)

FBI FILES: *And Rep. Celler* (page 2)

CIVIL RIGHTS: *Lyndon's strategy* (page 3)

STATE DEPARTMENT: *Poll Propaganda* (page 3)

BRICKER AMENDMENT II: *Victory* (page 4)

How to Beat Foreign Aid: "You don't have to be crazy to give all the money the Government wants for what they call 'foreign aid' — but it helps," is a sagacity that goes from mouth to mouth in Congressional cloakrooms this week.

What most members mean by this is — why be so crazy as to go against the wishes of all your constituents? In short, the tremendous public upsurge against government spending has come to focus on the Administration's insistence on a big appropriation for foreign aid (much of which is regarded as pure boondoggling). Last week, this won expression in the near-billion dollar cut endorsed overwhelmingly by the House. "They heard from home." Indeed, listening to the plain common sense from the home folks is one way of beating foreign aid.

This week, the Senate has begun to show signs of following the House example, although Administration leaders have started to tell the country that such cuts threaten the military defense in our global system of defense against Communist aggression. When members of Congress retort that the Treasury contains at least $6 billion unused funds already appropriated, the Administration boys holler, "We can't shift economic aid appropriations from one area to another."

Representative Lawrence Smith (R.-Wis.), veteran member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, thinks that one way to "beat foreign aid boondoggling" is to clarify this matter.

"That argument — that we cannot shift funds," he tells HUMAN EVENTS, "is nonsense. Last year and this, we members of Congress have written into the foreign aid bills wide and flexible authority, so that the Executive arm could shift funds from one area of spending to another, as conditions change or emergencies arise. The public probably does not know that 'defense support' is a part of 'economic aid,' and contains plenty of money to help sustain the economies of friendly nations which are trying to build up their military establishments and their own economies.

"No country — Korea or any other," emphasized Rep. Smith, "will suffer or become weaker as a result of the present cuts in foreign aid. This is the usual bureaucratic game (whether under Democratic or GOP administrations) to bid high, in order to get as much money as they want or more. If Congress sustains these cuts, watch and see if the Administration doesn't come out, reverse its attitude and say 'we've got enough to maintain our defense position all over the world.' "

Another way to "beat foreign aid" is to expose the machinations of State Department propaganda for "the foreign boondoggling." Revelations of this activity have stirred Congress and turned many votes against Administration big money requests. (For that story, see STATE DEPARTMENT PROPAGANDA below.)

Finally, many members have learned some pitfalls connected with those well-advertised "foreign junkets," trips to "inspect" the operation of foreign aid, etc. (If they refused to go on the junkets, they would be assailed as "isolationist.") They have learned that the State Department has its intelligence service which renders detailed reports on the deportment of members of Congress on such journeys. In the past, a number of members — it is rumored — have been controlled in their voting on such aid, because the State Department possesses blackmail information and can use it. Now, as a result of prudence, more members vote freely.

This sort of game has become better known as a result of much mouth-to-mouth intelligence in the cloakrooms. Consequently, many members have learned that discretion is the better part of legislative independence.

One Senator told HUMAN EVENTS: "Last time I went to Europe, one of our Embassies sent me a bottle of whisky to my hotel. I returned it with thanks. In another capital, I was urged to go on a night-life party. I declined. When I'm on a junket, I'm strictly business."

How to Get Political Mileage: A contest between Democratic and Republican leaderships in Washington to make the biggest impression on the Negro vote — that is what all the maneuverings by the White House and by these leaderships in Congress amount to. All the press corps in the Capital are agreed on this view. But the devious politicos may be "laying an egg." Numerous letters on the matter received by HUMAN EVENTS suggest that the public is not deceived but is disgusted with the activities of both parties.

For some of the more long-range consequences of this imbroglio — see item "CIVIL RIGHTS HUGGER MUGGER" on page 3.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How to Block National Security: On Capitol Hill, they refer to the "Celler problem." For Representative Emanuel Celler (D.-N.Y.), as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has been exercising his power to block the "reporting out" of the bill backed by the Department of Justice and FBI which is designed to protect FBI files from the prying eyes of defense lawyers. Many of the latter are Communists or represent Communist defendants in Government suits. Approach of Congressional adjournment gives nervous impetus to those aware of the danger of no legislation to modify the perilous consequences of the Supreme Court's Jencks decision.

Who is responsible for this parliamentary delay? "Liberal" Celler, Congressman of a Manhattan district containing a large number of Communists and assorted leftists, has never over-strained himself to facilitate passage of legislation written to protect national security against Communists.

Also, various Washington law firms, whose members are former New and Fair Deal officials of the same stripe as Celler, and who now represent big corporations fearing anti-trust prosecution, have a vested interest in blocking such legislation. They are lobbying ably and industriously in Capitol Hill corridors to this end. For these attorneys would like to have the power to dip into the FBI files to discover what evidence the Department of Justice has against their clients.

Finally, Speaker Rayburn himself, as always, ready to give ear to Democratic "liberals," has so far failed to order Celler to "report out" the measure. Once "reported," the House, it's generally agreed, would speedily pass it.

What to do About Syria: The pro-Communist *coup d'etat* in Syria seems to find both the President (in his press conference this week) and the State Department with no definite suggestions as to how to deal with the event.

However, an interesting dispatch (sent from Istanbul to the Washington *Star* just before the coup) offers a new line of thinking to Westerners who are at a loss, since the British debacle in the Middle East, to say what power should now take the lead in that troubled area.

Turkey, says Constantine Brown of the *Star*, is being "elected" by smaller anti-Communist countries of the Middle East to be "their friend, ally and defender."

This sensational dispatch stirred Washington's diplomatic row, which (HUMAN EVENTS reported on May 4) was speculating that a Moslem power like Turkey, with no link to nor sympathy with Israeli expansionist ambitions, might eventually take the lead and save the situation in that region. This is a task which none of the Arab states, rent by quarrels and militarily impotent, seem able to shoulder. Last April and May, it is recalled, was the time of the attempted Red coup in Jordan; and the day was saved not only by the dispatch of the American Sixth Fleet but also (and probably more importantly) by the appearance of two Turkish divisions on the Syrian frontier. The Turks have an army, know how to fight and are strongly anti-Communist.

As a result of this Turkish move last April, says Brown in the above-mentioned dispatch from Istanbul, "Turkey more than any other nation gained an unprecedented prestige among the Middle Eastern peoples." He goes on to report that Turkey, in view of the fact that her army possesses the most powerful ground forces of the NATO, is being "accepted — somewhat reluctantly — by most Arabs and Moslems between the Mediterranean and India as the leading power to which all must look for guidance and eventual assistance."

Turkey, it is emphasized, does not appear eager for such a role, in view of many internal difficulties of building up her industry; and the reluctance of the Arabs is explained by their memories of the days when Turkey was the Ottoman Empire and ruled over them. But, as Brown remarks, nature abhors a vacuum and the departure of Britain from the dominant and guiding position in this area has left a vacuum which "has to be filled."

In short, diplomatic circles observe, Turkey — which as the Ottoman Empire, once oppressed the Arabs — now seems to be emerging as their Moslem "big brother.'

Reuther's Coup: Walter Reuther has captured front page headlines everywhere with his plea to Ford, GM and Chrysler to "fight inflation" by reducing auto prices by a $100 a car.

Careful readers noted that Reuther promised only to reduce union "demands" in his next contract negotiations.

Reuther has already announced a demand for a four day week "without reduction in pay" (which alone would cost about 60 cents an hour) plus fringe and other benefits. Thus, he would be "reducing" his demand, even if he asked "only" 30 cents an hour.

The "kicker" in the Reuther publicity stunt — according to experts on Reutherism — is the proposal that, in order to make sure auto prices shall be "reasonable," they shall be set by an impartial review panel consisting of one person selected by management, one by UAW, and one by these two. This "nose inside the tent" has been Socialist Reuther's long-range goal.

Some experts here say the auto makers should simply offer to maintain present prices if UAW will maintain present wage costs, or offer as an alternative to cut prices by 3 per cent if wage costs are cut 3 per cent.

However, the reply of a motor company official to this suggestion was: "To try to outfox Reuther is like going into barehanded combat with a polecat." To prove that point he cited Reuther's tactics in UAW's postwar strike against General Motors. Among the union leader's sensational charges was one that General Motors "had deliberately falsified the figures in its books." He offered no proof but after the strike was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over, he was asked about the charge at a press conference. "Oh that," he said with a hearty laugh. "I just thought that was a good way to put the company over the barrel."

State Department Propaganda: Even old hands on Capitol Hill, long accustomed to dealing with the tricky and expensive pipe dreams originating in bureaucratic quarters, suffered a jolt this week when it was disclosed that the State Department has been conducting its own public opinion polls for the last 14 years, financing them with "emergency funds," and using the findings to propagandize for foreign aid and other projects.

A House committee, prompted by the results of a poll "leaked" to Washington and New York papers, uncovered the following startling facts:

● The State Department has contracted for 7 or 8 public opinion polls annually since 1944. Since 1945, it has been under contract with the National Opinion Research Center, an organization affiliated with the University of Chicago.

● Total Department expenditures on these polls over the 14 year period amounted to $552,927.38. The cost of the polls was paid from an appropriation entitled "Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service."

● Results of the polls were often absurd and interpreted as favoring more government spending. (One poll "revealed" 90% of those interviewed to be in favor of high spending foreign aid!) Evidence indicated the government used taxpayers' money to launch a propaganda drive in behalf of continued big spending. Special letter writing drives were organized to pressure Senators and Representatives who were outspoken in favor of reducing the Eisenhower foreign spending budget.

Supreme Court Decisions: The possibility that the Government may have to drop its case against the Soviet "master spy" Rudolf Abel — rather than open certain FBI files, due to the recent Jencks decision of the Supreme Court — has received wide publicity in the nation's press. How could the FBI open up its very hush-hush files to Abel's attorney?

Not so well publicized, however, are the possible effects of another Supreme Court decision — the Mallory Case. In that June 24 decision, the Supreme Court reversed the rape conviction of Andrew R. Mallory on the grounds that he was held too long between arrest and arraignment. The decision was interpreted as barring headquarters questioning of suspects that leads to confessions, and has created nationwide alarm among law enforcers.

Residents of the District of Columbia felt the first impact of the Mallory decision this week, as the U.S. Court of Appeals reversed the first-degree murder conviction of Clarence Watson, Jr. Last December, in one of the most notorious trials to hit the Capital in recent years, Watson was found guilty of slaying a Government secretary while attempting to rape her in her hotel room. His conviction was reversed because of its similarity to the Supreme Court's Mallory decision.

Civil Rights Hugger Mugger: Two aspects, glossed over by most of the press, mark the intolerably confused political situation arising from the Civil Rights bill fight:

● The GOP as a party and as a party label has received a body blow in the South — such is the opinion expressed by many observers who have studied the reactions south of the Mason-Dixon line. The determined stand of the White House and GOP Congressional leadership — they say — has set back the prestige of the Southern Republican political growth which have sprouted since the Ike victory of 1952. The periodic claims of the GOP National Headquarters that the Republican party in the South has made headway and would bring about for the first time since the Civil War a real two-party system in the South — these assertions can no longer seriously be made since the White House and the GOP Congressional leaders stood behind Part III of the Administration bill (which authorized the sending of Federal troops).

Republican candidates will have a much harder time and some of those in Congress may well be missing after the next election in '58, it is believed in the Capital. The GOP label has become associated in the minds of Southern whites with Thaddeus Stevens and the horrors of the Reconstruction era. Many Negro voters in the South will prefer to exert their voting strength in Congressional and local elections through local Democratic machines, which in many areas have already established a following among Negro voters. As for the presidential election, it would be a brave prophet who would claim that any Republican hopeful now discernible on the political horizon could deliver in 1960 with 67 Southern electoral votes won by Eisenhower in the 1956 election.

The strategists in the White House and GOP National Committee have probably already discounted any Southern electoral votes next general election and expect to compensate by winning Negro minority bloc votes in Northern big-city states. If so, however, it would be well — say political observers here — to be ready to discount in the future any cheery boasts from Republican quarters that they are "making progress in the South."

● The Southern strategy on the Civil Rights bill is very long-range, much more so than has hitherto been believed — say insiders in the Democratic party. The Southern Democratic strategy (which is that of Rayburn and Johnson, but is not palatable to the rank and file of the Southern members of Congress) is based on the calculation that the Republicans will lose out in the '58 Congressional elections. The Democratic leaders figure that Republicans will lose about a half-dozen seats in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Senate (a forecast admitted by some Republicans); and that the GOP will sustain a big loss in the House, the magnitude of which will be disputed by many Republicans.

The Lyndon Johnson-Sam Rayburn leadership group warns recalicitrant Southern members that such an outcome will weight the next Congress heavily on the side of "liberals" — such as Douglas and Humphrey. Under their aegis, a much tougher bill would be passed (so runs the Johnson argument). But, if the compromise bill just passed by the Senate becomes law — they hasten to add — a "liberal" Congress meeting in 1959 would leave the compromise law alone for a few years "to see how it works out."

They would also leave it alone, for the simple reason that Democrats in 1959 would be thinking of 1960 and "party unity." No bill now, and a "tough bill" passed in 1959 would bring about — so has run their argument — a split in the Democratic party in the 1960 convention and the rise of a Third "Southern" States Rights party.

To which final argument, some Southern members retort — "you mean it would prevent the nomination of Lyndon Johnson as Democratic presidential candidate."

Bricker Amendment II: Despite Administration pressure, Congress this week adopted a new and little-known "Bricker amendment," this one curbing the President's "give-away" powers under his international "Atoms for Peace" program.

Sponsored by Senator John Bricker of Ohio, the proviso is an amendment to legislation implementing U.S. participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency (see HUMAN EVENTS for July 27).

Actually, the Administration pressure in this case backfired, because the amendment finally agreed to by the House and Senate, after conference compromises, is broader than the proviso originally proposed by Bricker.

The amendment initially approved by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee provided that after the initial 5,000 kilograms of enriched uranium, already pledged to the international Agency by Mr. Eisenhower, no additional atomic materials could be turned over to it except with specific approval from Congress.

The amendment was accepted by the Senate without fuss but the House, yielding to White House importunings, deleted it from the bill. Conferees, working out a compromise version acceptable to both chambers, restored it — but in broadened form so that the requirement (for specific Congressional authorization for every foreign disposal of fissionable materials) applies to so-called "bi-lateral" atomic treaties which this country has negotiated individually with nearly 40 other nations, and also includes Euratom. The original curb applied only to supplying materials to the IAEA.

The amendment also provides that such materials turned over to the IAEA cannot be given away, but rather must be compensated for at not less than the going rate set by the AEC for such materials domestically. Observers remark that under this proviso, no foreign nation can afford to acquire these materials. Therefore, in essence, the International Atomic Agency becomes little more than an "international glee club." This outcome represented a sharp defeat for the internationalists. It is also a tribute to the victorious handful of conservatives who fought the original measure.

Larson's Latest: Arthur Larson's USIA has long been noted for projects such as explaining to the people of underdeveloped countries — who need free enterprise in order to realize their full potential — that TVA is typical of the American system. But given an opportunity to make a striking blow against communism, Larson's USIA often proves less able.

Such is the case in the recent publication of *The New Class* by Milovan Djilas (Prager, $3.95). The manuscript was written while the author was under house arrest in Yugoslavia, and was smuggled out just before he was taken to prison. The "new class," of course, is the bureaucracy, which according to Djilas is far more brutal than the capitalists because it has a monopoly of both political and economic power.

It is agreed here that this is the most devastating exposure of communism in practice yet written, and to everyone in Washington the book looked like a natural for USIA exploitation to all peoples under communism or threatened with communism. But that cannot be, for the Yugoslav government told the State Department that the promotion of *The New Class* would be regarded as an unfriendly act. So USIA will keep hands off, and return to its old habits of promoting TVA.

Letter from L. R. CLAUSEN, former Chairman, J. I. Case Company: "I have been a long-time subscriber to HUMAN EVENTS and feel that the information it contains is of such importance that I have sent subscriptions to several other members of my family. I have recommended it to many friends as the information referred to does not appear in other publications that come to my attention."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIV, No. 34 HUMAN EVENTS August 24, 1957

Article Section I

OUR UNSEEN NATIONAL DEBT

The Burden of Social Security

By FRANK CHODOROV

LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

POLITICIANS on the make are rouging their lips with talk of tax relief. The citizenry is being told that a sizeable cut in the budget will almost automatically result in a lowering of levies, and the promise is accepted at face value because the general impression is that there is a relationship between taxation and government expense. Maybe so. But, do we know what government expense amounts to? Is all of it in the budget? Or, are there bills which the government, like a profligate housewife, has managed to hide from the paying public? Are there legal obligations which by dexterous bookkeeping do not appear in the government's expense account, but which the taxpayer will be called upon to meet?

There are. The most important of these obligations is the Old Age Security Insurance (OASI). In 1954, when the latest study* of this operation was made, the liability of the government under it came to $280 billion – something more than the known national debt. This is the amount of "insurance" the government had written up to that time. Even if the government should discontinue OASI, it would still owe $280 billion to those who since its inception had been compelled to pay social security taxes; provided, of course, it does not repudiate its obligation, and provided also that the wholesale demise of beneficiaries does not provide relief.

Critics of OASI (a categorical imperative in socialistic philosophy) have long known that there is no actuarial relationship between social security taxes and promised benefits, and that at some time the government would have to fall back on higher tax rates or printed money to make good. The law was passed in 1937. For some years the tax-take exceeded payments, simply because the bulk of the insured had many years to go before they would be entitled to benefits.

The situation was exactly like that of the fraternal organizations that flourished in this country in the early part of this century; the members who joined up were mostly young people and the dues collected were more than sufficient to meet the occasional death benefits to which the rules entitled the beneficiaries. There would come a time when – but that consideration did not enter into the actuarial figures of the organizations, and when the inevitable happened their treasuries ran dry. This consequence was pointed out by some opponents of OASI, but their arguments did not prevail because they were politically unsound.

During the twenty years since OASI was started, the excess of income over outgo has been "invested" in government bonds, and it was hopefully expected that the interest on these bonds – or new taxes – would be sufficient to meet the accruing obligations. It should be remembered that all social security taxes are nothing but income taxes; whatever is collected under this title (minus operating expenses) is thrown into the common till of the Treasury and spent on any and all undertakings of government; not one cent of it is ear-marked for the purpose for which it was collected. The government then sets up a "reserve" of its own bonds in the amount of its collections. The interest on these bonds, which in the beginning was hopefully expected to be enough to meet all claims, is derived from new taxes, and thus becomes a burden on a new generation of producers. The benefits received by the "insured" do not come from their compulsory savings.

In point of fact, the operation of government "insurance" is quite analogous to what would be called corrupt, and is in fact illegal, in a private insurance company. If such a company were to spend premiums as they come in – on salaries and cocktail parties – and were to pay beneficiaries out of new premiums, its directors would be subject to criminal proceedings. But, who can send a government to jail?

AT ANY RATE, what the critics of OASI pointed out when it was instituted has come to pass. The day of reckoning is here. A story in the *Wall Street Journal* (July 17) begins with this statement: "For the first time in its history, Uncle Sam's vast Social Security system this year will probably dole out more benefits than it collects in taxes." That is, OASI faces a condition commonly known as insolvency. What to do?

The bedevilled bureaucrats are still of the opinion that the interest on the bonds in the "reserve" fund – now estimated at about $24 billion – will make up the difference between expected income and expected outgo, but they are far from sure. For one thing, if payrolls should drop – from layoffs, strikes or even curtailment of overtime work – the tax-take will come tumbling after. For another thing, the government has in recent years gathered into the fold a new host of beneficiaries and many of these will shortly be stepping up to the handout window. A couple of years ago the independent farmers were invited to partake of the largesse, and a considerable number of these entrepreneurs are rapidly reaching the age of 65.

A deficit is therefore in prospect. If it occurs, the government may, under the law, sell some of its "reserve" bonds and use the proceeds to meet the emergency; but that would be like a company eating up its capital. More likely, for the present, Congress will be called upon to make an appropriation, which

*Actuarial Study No. 39, published by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under the title "Long Range Cost Estimates for OASI."

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have to be met by the general taxpayer. It may resort to upping payroll taxes.

It is possible, as the OASI proponents claimed, that the original figures were correct, that payroll taxes plus "reserve" income would have been sufficient to meet the claims of those who were "insured" under the 1937 law. But, government "insurance" is not controlled by actuarial figures; it is and must be run by the indeterminate rules of political expediency. OASI originated in two political purposes; one, to win votes and, two, to increase the revenues of an ever-expanding government. Since the "poor," in the aggregate, constitute the most affluent segment of society, the sagacious thing to do was to tap its income; certainly, the national pay envelope has more "ability to pay" than any other source mine. But the "poor" not only have the most money in the country, they also have the most votes. Expediency therefore dictated the sugar-coating of the social security (income) tax with the promise of a return, a return made glamorous with a "social" purpose and adorned with an unearned increment, and who is it that rejects "something for nothing?"

However, the take from the "poor" originally included in OASI proved insufficient for a government ever on the prowl for more authority. It needed more money. In search for more sources of revenue, the bureaucrats decided to expand the category of "poor." The law was therefore changed, so that now not only wage earners are "insured," but also self-employed professionals, farmers, ministers, military personnel and nearly everybody else who earns a dollar. Some of these groups are invited to partake of the benefits of OASI, but that is as far as voluntarism enters the scheme; the taxes are compulsory. There is reason to believe, also, that for purely fiscal reasons nobody, including the multi-millionaire, will ultimately be allowed to reject social security.

This extension of "insurance" coverage was called "liberalization" of the OASI law. It is estimated that if all those who can avail themselves of old age benefits, including those who have no choice in the matter, were to sign up, fully 90% of all who are gainfully employed would come under its confiscatory aegis. The "liberalization" consisted not only of increasing the number of taxpayers and soon-to-be-beneficiaries, but also in making OASI more generous. For, now widows become eligible for benefits at the age of 62, rather than 65, while the permanently disabled can enter claims at the age of 50. All of this, of course, made a jumble of the original figures of the OASI pundits, and hastened the day of reckoning.

ADDING to the fiscal headache of OASI managers is the pernicious habit recently acquired by people of living too long and therefore of drawing checks beyond the time originally allotted to them. If the doctors were not so efficient in prolonging life, or if a substantial epidemic, affecting only old people, were to come along periodically, the worries of OASI would be mitigated. Lacking such relief, it seems that Congress will have to come to the rescue.

"Fund managers," says the *Wall Street Journal* story, "now predict benefit payments will top contributions by some $300 million. Next year, it is estimated, the gap will spread to $600 million. And in 1959, benefits may exceed contributions by as much as $1 billion." (These figures do not appear in the budget now under congressional consideration.)

The picture is dark. There are, however, some light shades to ease the gloom of bureaucratic embarrassment. First, the law provides for increases of payroll taxes in 1960, so that, if their figures are supported by hoped for eventualities (such as a continuing high rate of employment and income), there should be a surplus again in that year. By 1975, they believe, they will be out of the woods altogether, for in that year the tax rate (under present law) will reach 4¼ per cent of income, plus a like "contribution" from employers. (This latter factor is the something-for-nothing gimmick in the law. What the employer is compelled to shell out is added to his expense of doing business, necessarily, and shows up in the prices of the commodities or services he sells. That is, the "contribution" – plus the usual markup – is paid by the consumers, most of whom are the employees whose pay envelope had already been filched.)

Another relieving bright tint in the picture is the high birth rate since World War II. In a few years these babies and youngsters will start earning an income and will therefore become OASI premium payers. It will be forty or fifty years before they will become eligible for benefits, and during that time they will help support their "retired" progenitors. That brings us up to the twenty-first century, when most of the present lawmakers and bureaucrats will have passed to their reward, bequeathing the problem to their successors.

In the meantime, until the higher rates and the fecundity of American mothers come to the rescue, Congress will be called upon to consider ways and means. They could, for instance, import a couple of million workers from behind the Iron Curtain (say, between the ages of 21 and 30) for the express purpose of paying social security taxes. Or, which is more feasible, they could make the 1960 payroll taxes applicable in 1958. Then, again, they could put out a special social security bond issue, thus again deflating the value of the dollar, while meeting its OASI obligations. In any case, can taxes be reduced?

(P.S. OASI is only one of several accruing and un-budgeted obligations which in time the unsuspecting taxpayer must grapple.)

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "OUR UNSEEN NATIONAL DEBT" at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed Bill me ☐

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XIV, No. 34 HUMAN EVENTS August 24, 1957

Article Section II

THE LIBRARY

NO BETS ON MODERN REPUBLICANISM

By HANDICAPPER

SOME PEOPLE can't understand how a statesman who "loves people," as President Eisenhower is supposed to, manages to land so often on the anti-people side of questions.

After all, handing over Southern election officials to the tender mercies of Federal judges, authorized to slap on injunctions which aren't supposed to happen to a "yellow dog" labor leader, isn't exactly a humanitarian idea. It doesn't look any better because modern Republicans think they have to be for it in order to snag the so-called Negro vote.

And how do you account for a regular guy, and a former Supreme Commander at that, working up so much enthusiasm over surrendering another American soldier to the former enemy to be tried for an offense committed when the soldier was on duty?

The truth is you can't account for it unless you're a horse player who has been confronted with the horrible dilemma: whether to back the horse favored by the snobs in the fashionable Turf and Field Club, or take the "good thing" handed out "by the owner himself" via the attendant in the gentleman's rest room. Ike definitely resembles that undecided man. When he first heard about how the cagey drafters of the Civil Rights Bill had dubbed in some stuff from the Thaddeus Stevens era which would have given the Federal Government power to enforce school integration by military force, he reacted as any normal American would: he didn't like it.

Being a moderate man, he didn't blow up and sock Attorney General Brownell for letting the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People dream up laws for him. But he did indicate that, if he could get to the betting window without meeting anybody, he wouldn't back Section III of the bill. Fortunately, the Senate scratched Section III (by NAACP out of Reconstruction), and Ike was spared that decision.

But, of course, he was bound to run into some of those Modern Republican masterminds on the way back to the Box. It's pretty difficult to resist "information" from a sportsman with a bowler hat, field glasses a foot long, and a Long Island estate, although following such information – particularly if it comes from one who owns a horse in the race – can lead to acute financial embarrassment.

Anyway, by the time the Jury Trial amendment came up, Ike had the right answers ready. The Common Man in the grandstand or the infield might wonder how come a murderer or a thief should be better entitled to a jury trial than some Confederate election registrar who was charged with closing the polls before the field hands had a chance to get to town to vote. But the sharpers in the club house saw nothing wrong with that, because a man even suspected of interfering with the right to vote was obviously not entitled to privileges enjoyed by "sex deviates" who attack little boys and pack the remains in the deep freeze. Even Hoffa and "Johnny Dio" got jury trials: Ike probably had an outside hunch that Trial by Jury was an overlay, but he went along with the sentiment upstairs.

Of course, a little deep thought might have engendered some doubt of the wisdom of this wager, for the Modern Republicans in their anxiety to corral and increase the Negro Vote might conceivably create a White Vote which they wouldn't get. Just recently I heard a man in Northern city say, "I have a lot of sympathy with the Southern people. In this town the Negroes supply 20 per cent of the population, 5 per cent of the taxes and 70 per cent of the crime." Getting most of my statistical information from the Racing Form, I don't vouch for those figures, but the fact that a Northerner, probably a Republican, accepts them suggests that maybe President Eisenhower, Senator Knowland and Vice-President Nixon might have clammed up, instead of moaning so audibly after the Senate had stood by Jury Trial, no matter what Informed and Modern Circles thought about it.

Dick Nixon knew perfectly well that the Senate had done worse many times than stand by the ancient Right of Trial by Jury. His comment that the vote was something terrible must have been directed solely to the constituents of Adam Clayton Powell. A good many other people also vote, however, and mighty few of them are against Trial by Jury. Leaving out the Constitution and going strictly by the past performance charts for Average Voter, the smarter politicians in Congress gave Trial by Jury a play.

GIVE Ike a copy of the *Daily Running Constitution* or the *Horseman's Federalist Papers* and turn him loose in the grandstand, where the big owners and Modern Republican swells wouldn't be caught dead, and my guess is that most of the time he'd end the day ahead of the game. He stuck to Natural Gas until he met somebody on the stairs who had heard from a jockey's brother-in-law that Senator Case of North Dakota had been offered a grand to put a sponge in the animal's nostril. So he laid off, and Natural Gas was disqualified on account of what should have been dismissed as a "frivolous claim of foul."

Also Ike has wisely laid off a highly touted gelding called TVA. He did get the shakes because of a coup hatched by the Memphis Mob to throw the public off the track by a lot of shallow propaganda designed to convince the suckers that a nag called Dixon-Yates was really Citation painted over. This time the Royal Enclosure group lacked the guts to come to the rescue, and they even went so far as to leave a Boston Banker in the lurch – the kind of thing you wouldn't think could happen in the Turf and Field Club. Ike could have taken care of the whole thing by putting two bucks on Dixon-Yates' nose at a Wednesday press conference, but he didn't. I don't know why. All I know is you can land on a lot of stiffs by listening to tips from "experts" who are new to the game.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It could be that this supposed "friendship" between Eisenhower and Marshal Zhukov is something like that. In the heady days of 1945, when the Red Army was supposed to be a force for peace, democracy and universal brotherhood, Ike and the Marshal appear to have had some sort of haw-haw acquaintance in Germany. They had their pictures taken together and, although they didn't change hats or do any clowning, the meeting has been built up (on our side anyway) into a friendship upon which could be erected the Parliament of Mankind or something of the sort.

Give a thing like this a few years, and, like the racing nut trying to make a champion out of a dog called Trojan Magistrate, almost anybody could build a slap on the back into a beautiful friendship. At a Wednesday press conference some Knight of the Quill asks, "Do you think, Sir, that you might invite your old friend, Marshal Zhukov, to visit you here?" Well, international relations being what they are, the President could hardly reply, "Oh don't give me that old friend stuff! We just saw each other a few minutes before Zhukov turned his goons loose on the German civilians." But, if Ike hadn't been just a little bit taken in by the Zhukov legend – the way a woman builds up a man she might have married into really something – he would not have gone into that routine about how shook up he got when Zhukov pointed out that Communism involved "sacrifice" whereas capitalism was "materialistic."

Probably there was no good course on Communism at the U. S. Military Academy when Ike was a cadet. Otherwise, he could have made Zukie's hair curl by saying: "Boy, can I blackmail you! A Red Army general sneering at materialism, which is the basis of Marx-Leninist economic philosophy! Shall I turn you in for a Trotskyist wrecker, or a bourgeois deviate?" Come to think of it, Ike may be cuter than some people think. He could be playing this friendship with Zhukov just to get Zhukov liquidated as a crypto-Fascist. I'm not backing this theory – just a low, unmodern fancy that crossed my mind.

ANYWAY, I like to play with the speculation that the Modern Republicans, intent on unfrocking the Constitution and handing over our assets to Europe and our military personnel to Asia, may have permitted a Trojan Horse to be dragged into their midst. Certainly, to change the metaphors, there is evidence that Ike has to be ridden with a tight rein and given a quick jab with the spurs when passing some familiar object like jury trial for southern poll watchers. It is also plain that the President does not share the contempt for Congress which seems to have cankered the Supreme Court and most Modern Republicans. Any time he studies his *Morning Telegraph* and hurries right to the window to get his bet down, pausing neither for a tip from Paul Hoffman or a hot wire from Arden House, he backs a plausible mount. But his disposition seems to be to hold off to the last minute, or even the minute after that, before making up his mind.

Connoisseurs recall the time in San Francisco during the G.O.P. 1956 convention when Harold Stassen finally gave up his idiotic effort to push Vice-President Nixon off the ticket. At an Eisenhower press conference, held after Stassen had told Ike that the putsch against Nixon was over, somebody asked Ike whether, if he were a delegate to the convention, he would vote for Nixon. By that time, the run-of-mine politician would have thought it safe to say, "Yes," and to hell with it. But not Ike. Like the man who can't go for Count Fleet in a field of $1500 platers until he has studied the form right up to post time, Ike hemmed and hawed and said that, inasmuch as he wasn't a delegate, it wouldn't be right for him to express an opinion. "There are so many people that could be brought up," and so on and so forth. But when Nixon had crossed the wire an easy winner, Ike spoke as if he'd been rooting for him all the way around.

It's probably irrelevant, but I remember once going to the races with, *inter alia*, the late Heywood Broun. After every race, Heywood would shout, "I had him!" and pull out the winning ticket. I thought I'd never seen such phenomenal handicapping outside professional ranks until, along about the sixth race, it developed that Heywood had a ticket not only on the winner but on every other horse in the race! That's one way to play the races if you're the type that finds decisions difficult. In politics it's well to have at least a show ticket on an outsider. After all, Equipoise got beat when backed down to 1 to 10. And look what happened to Dewey in 1948! Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the darling of the Zionists, had a show ticket on Ibn Saud in his pocket all the time.

As a cautious horse lover, who always assumes that the odds against being right are about 20 to 1, I can always pass up a race and wait for a stronger hunch. It might be a good idea for Ike to do the same thing now and then. What's wrong with leaving the ink-stained minions of the press in suspense and saying "No comment?" That was the reply made by Charlie Wilson to every question as to how he felt about a visit by Marshal Zhukov. It saved a lot of horsing around.

But President Eisenhower, like most horse players, seems to think he has to back something, even if he can't think of a good reason to expect his selection to get anywhere. Those plays against Private Girard and Jury Trial illustrate what I mean. Ike never got them out of the form sheets; they're strictly by Misinformation out of Modern Republicanism. It's no worse than 8 to 5 that Ike's own hunch would have been better.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "NO BETS ON MODERN REPUBLICANISM" at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED